

Amendment to the Drawings:

Please replace two drawing sheets (showing FIGs. 1 and 2) with the newly-submitted figures attached herewith on separate sheets.

REMARKS

The Examiner is thanked for the thorough examination of the present application. The Office Action, however, tentatively rejected all claims 1-24. However, only claim 17 has been rejected based upon prior art. In this regard, claims 1-16, 18-24 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, as allegedly failing to comply with the enablement requirement. Claim 17 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as allegedly anticipate by *Choi et al.* (US 2004/0056828). In response, Applicant submits the foregoing amendments and the following remarks. Claim 17 is amended to fix a minor editorial error.

I. Response To Drawings Objection Under 37 CFR 1.83(a)

FIG. 1 is amended to show the first state S_{11} and the second state S_{12} . FIG. 2 is amended to show the first state S_{21} and the second state S_{22} . Thus, the objection to the drawings under 37 CFR 1.83(a) has been accommodated and now should be withdrawn.

Additionally, Applicant has amended the specification to add symbols S_{11} , S_{12} , and S_{22} in the specification to correspond to the amended drawings.

II. Response To Rejections Under 37 U.S.C. §112, first paragraph

The Office Action objected to the specification as failing to provide proper antecedent basis for certain claimed subject matter. Correspondingly, the Office Action also rejected claims 1-16 and 18-24 under 35 U.S.C. § 112, first paragraph. Applicant has amended the specification and drawing to reference the claimed first and second

states (S_{11} and S_{12}). Since the first state and the second state are shown in FIGs. 1 and 2, and now referenced in the specification, the objection to the specification and claim rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 112, first paragraph, should be withdrawn.

III. Response To Rejections Under 37 U.S.C. §112, second paragraph

The Office Action also rejected claims 11-16 and 20-24 under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph. Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration and withdrawal of these rejections.

As described in claims 11 and 20, a voltage level is generated across the capacitor in response to the first state of the voltage signal and maintained in response to the second state of the voltage signal. Since the voltage level controls current of the first circuit and keeps the same during the first and second states of the voltage signal, the first circuit keeps providing a current of $(1+1/N)I$ during the first and second states of the voltage signal.

As described in paragraph [022] of the specification, the voltage level across the capacitor 24 during the write stage is maintained at V_c , which turns on the first transistor 20. Since the gate to source voltage V_{gs} of the first transistor 20 is kept at V_c , a third current equal to approximately $(1+1/N) I_{DATA}$ from the first transistor 20 flows to the second circuit 18. It is known that the scan line 12 turns off the PMOS transistors 22 and 30 during the second state of the voltage signal. As a result, the third current from the first transistor 20 cannot flow to the left branch (transistors 22 and 30). The only current path left for the third current is through the transistor 26, and then to

continuously turn on the transistors 26 and 28. Accordingly, the third transistor 26 turns on the fourth transistor 28 and flows to the LED 32.

With this explanation, Applicant submits that it should be clear how the first circuit provides the current of $(1+1/N)I$ during the first and second states. Accordingly, the rejection should be withdrawn. In this regard, it is not necessary that the claim itself enable the understanding of a person skilled in the art, but rather that is the function of the specification. With the description provided above, Applicant submits that the claimed subject matter is fully enabled, and that the claims comply with all statutory requirements, including the requirements of 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph.

IV. Response To Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. §102(e)

Claim 17 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as allegedly anticipated by *Choi* et al. (US 2004/0056828). Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration and withdrawal for at least the following reasons.

A claim is anticipated only if each and every element as set forth in the claim is found, either expressly or inherently described, in a single prior art reference.

Verdegaal Bros. v. Union Oil Co. of California, 814 F.2d 628, 631, 2 USPQ2d 1051, 1053 (Fed. Cir. 1987). *Choi* does not disclose all limitations in the claim 17 such that the rejection should be withdrawn.

The independent claim 17 recites:

17. An electroluminescence device comprising:
a plurality of scan lines;
a plurality of data lines; and
an array of pixels, each of the pixels being disposed near an
intersection of one of the scan lines and one of the data lines comprising:

a first circuit further comprising a first transistor, a second transistor and a capacitor, the capacitor including a first terminal coupled to a power supply, the first transistor including a gate electrode coupled to a second terminal of the capacitor, and **the second transistor including a gate electrode receiving a voltage signal;**

a second circuit further comprising a third transistor and a fourth transistor, the third transistor including a gate electrode coupled to a gate electrode of the fourth transistor; and

a fifth transistor further comprising a gate electrode receiving the voltage signal, and an electrode receiving a current signal provided over a corresponding data line.

(*Emphasis added*). Claim 17 patently defines over the cited art for at least the reason that the cited art fails to disclose the features emphasized above.

As recited in page 5 of the Office Action, the Examiner equates “item T4 of *Choi* corresponds to the second transistor of the application and item T1 of *Choi* corresponds to the fifth transistor of the application”. In the application, however, the voltage signal received by the gate of the second transistor is the same as the signal received by the gate of the fifth transistor. Comparing with *Choi* (reference to FIG. 3), the gate of item T1 does not connect to the gate of item T4 such that the signal received by gate of item T1 is different from the signal received by gate of item T4. Since *Olarig* does not disclose all of the limitations in claim 17, the rejection of claim 17 under 35 U.S.C 102(e) should be withdrawn.

CONCLUSION

In light of the foregoing amendments and for at least the reasons set forth above, Applicant respectfully submits that all objections and/or rejections have been traversed, rendered moot, and/or accommodated, and that the now pending claims 1-19 are in

condition for allowance. Favorable reconsideration and allowance of the present application and all pending claims are hereby courteously requested.

No fee is believed to be due in connection with this submission. If, however, any fee is believed to be due, you are hereby authorized to charge any such fee to deposit account No. 20-0778.

Respectfully submitted,

/Daniel R. McClure/

Daniel R. McClure
Registration No. 38,962

THOMAS, KAYDEN, HORSTEMEYER & RISLEY, L.L.P.

Suite 1750
100 Galleria Parkway N.W.
Atlanta, Georgia 30339
(770) 933-9500